

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

-----  
CHARLES LAMONT NORWOOD,

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

3:07-cv-0624-bbc

CAPTAIN RADTKE, Correctional Officer at C.C.I.;  
GREG GRAMS, Warden at C.C.I.;  
AMY MILLARD, Complaint Examiner;  
TOM GOZINSKE, Complaint Examiner;  
AMY SMITH, Office of Secretary at Dept. of Corrections; and  
Psychologist ANDREA NELSON,

Defendants.  
-----

This is a case in which plaintiff Charles Norwood contends that defendants are being deliberately indifferent to his safety because they are refusing to grant him “pair with care” status. Plaintiff’s complaint has been served on defendants under this court’s informal service agreement with the Attorney General. Defendants have not yet answered the complaint. Now, plaintiff has filed a document titled “motion of reconsideration and to continue further process of change of address and clarification.” In this document, plaintiff alerts the court to the fact that he has been moved from the Columbia Correctional Institution to the Waupun Correctional Institution. Plaintiff believes that defendants

arranged the move in order to moot his claim that he is in imminent danger of serious physical injury because of his housing arrangements at Columbia. In plaintiff's view, he remains at risk in any Wisconsin state prison so long as he is refused "pair with care" or "red tag" status. He appears to be asking the court to permit his case to proceed to resolution.

As I told the parties in an order entered in this case on December 6, 2007, as soon as the defendants file their answer to plaintiff's complaint, I will schedule an evidentiary hearing at which plaintiff will have a chance to show that he has a reasonable probability of proving at trial his claim that he faces an immediate threat of serious physical injury. At this particular time, plaintiff should be considering what testimony he will give and gathering whatever documentary evidence he has to support his claim. Defendants should be prepared to produce witnesses or documentary evidence sufficient to allow the court to make an informed decision. If plaintiff succeeds in making the showing necessary for emergency injunctive relief, I will enter an order granting such relief.

Because there is no need to reconsider any matter already addressed in this action or to alter my decision to schedule this case for an evidentiary hearing as soon as defendants file their answer, plaintiff's motion will be denied.

#### ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff's "Motion of Reconsideration and to Continue further

process of Change of Address and Clarification” is DENIED as unnecessary.

Entered this 26th day of December, 2007.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

BARBARA B. CRABB

District Judge